CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES.

VOL. 1. FEBRUARY 1, 1830. NO. 10.

EDITED BY

AYLETT RAINS.

Earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints.—JUDE.

BAPTISM AND THE LORD'S SUPPER,

A review of Mr. Waldo's sermon, on the external rites of the Church, particularly Baptism.

[CONCLUDED FROM NO. 9.]

proof of this. Proof, friend W., is what we want; your *ipse dixits* are not worth a farthing. Prove that any of the apostles ever did,—ever had it in their power to baptize in, or with the Holy Spirit. On the day of Pentecost, and at the house of Cornelius, Jesus was the sole administrator of Holy Spirit baptism, for 'He,' says Peter, 'has shed forth this which ye now *see* and *hear*.' And more than this, this baptism when it was administered, was a thing that could be *seen* with the *eyes*, and *heard* with the *ears* of the whole multitude. Neither is there a man living who can prove that any individuals of Adam's family were ever baptized with, or in Holy Spirit and fire, except on the two occasions mentioned above. It is evident from both Testaments, that receiving the Holy Spirit, and being baptized in it, or with it, are things just as distinct in the economy of grace, as are drinking a glass of water, and being baptized in, or with water. All the holy prophets in old times, "spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit," but we are no where told that they had been baptized with it. The twelve Apostles, also, as we have already proved, preached and did many miracles by the spirit of God, long before the day of Pentecost, and consequently long before

they were the subjects of spiritual baptism. This spiritual baptism then, which Mr. W. ignorantly tells us was to be administered by the Apostles of Jesus, cannot be proved ever to have been administered more than twice, by any person, and in these cases, it can be proved,—it has been proved, that Jesus was the sole administrator; and furthermore, it may be learned from the tenth chapter of Acts, that those gentiles who at the house of Cornelius, were the subjects of Holy Spirit baptism, were afterwards, commanded by the Apostle Peter, to be baptized in water, "in the name of the Lord Jesus."

Mr. W. seems to be in a state of profound ignorance relative to the nature and design of spiritual baptism. He supposes that this baptism, of "a holy influence or flame" as he calls it, was the regenerating influence of the Holy Spirit; but it can be proved, that the very reverse of this is true! Baptism of the holy Spirit and fire, was a divine and miraculous attestation from heaven, which could be both *seen* and *heard*, of the truth of the Christian religion; and its immediate influence on those who were the subjects of it, was not any direct renovation or regeneration of mind, but the impartation of *miraculous gifts*. The baptism was *miraculous*, and consequently its effects were miraculous also. That this view of the subject is correct, permit me now to prove by a few testimonies. In 1. Cor. xii: 1. Paul says "Now concerning spiritual *gifts*, brethren, I would not have you ignorant." He then goes on to enumerate these *gifts*, as you may learn by reading the whole of this chapter, and after enumerating the whole of them, he comes, in the last verse, to this conclusion, "But covet earnestly the best gifts. And yet shew I unto you a more excellent way!" That is, I show unto you something more excellent than all these gifts!! Well, Paul, what is this more excellent way? *Ans. Charity!—Love!* This is more excellent than all the *spiritual gifts* which I have enumerated! For "though I speak with the *tongues of men*, and of *angels*, have the *gift of prophecy*, understand all mysteries and all knowledge, and have all faith so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing."—Here then is the doctrine of an Apostle with respect to *spir-*

itual gifts. They were not designed to purify the souls of those who possessed them, but were only miraculous *signs* or *evidences* by which unbelievers might be convinced of the truth of the Christian religion. 'Tongues,' says Paul, 'are for a *sign*, not to them that believe, but to them that believe not;' and he tells these Corinthians in the first chap. of this Epistle, that they 'came behind in *no gift*,'—'that they were *enriched* in all *utterance* and in all *knowledge*, and yet in the third chapter, he tells them that they were '*carnal*:' and afterwards charges them with getting drunk around the Lord's table, and furthermore, we know that Balaam had the *gift* of *prophecy*, and that the beast on which he rode had the *gift* of *tongues*, for 'the dumb ass speaking with *man's voice* forbade the madness of the *prophet!!*'

Now as Mr. W. has made such a great ado about the 'Holy influence and flame,' and about the *power* which the apostles were to receive from on high, let us go back to Pentecost and see if we can learn something about this matter. 'Tarry,' said Jesus, after he had commissioned his apostles to 'preach the gospel to every creature, baptizing them, &c.' 'tarry at Jerusalem until ye be endued with power from on high,' 'for ye shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit not many days hence.' Accordingly we find them in anxious expectation of the fulfilment of this promise of Messiah, on the day of Pentecost, 'with one accord, in one place.' 'And suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing, mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance:' 'and the multitude was confounded, because that every one did hear them speak in his own language.' 'We do hear them,' said they, 'speak in our own tongues the wonderful works of God.' Here then we have a circumstantial account of Holy Spirit baptism, with its effects. Now I ask, did any man ever administer such a baptism as this? Was this what Jesus commanded his apostles to do when they should baptize the nations? As

well might he have commanded them to take up the Atlantic ocean in the hollow of their hands, or to carry away the north star in their waistcoat pockets! I also ask what power was that which these apostles received from on high, on this eventful occasion? *Ans.* The power to speak with tongues! These apostles were illiterate fishermen of Galilee, and understood but one language, and consequently could not discharge the duties which devolved on them under their new commission,—could not 'preach the gospel to every creature,' until they were endued miraculously with power to speak intelligibly to all the nations of the earth. This was the power which they received, and for the reception of which, they were commanded to 'tarry at Jerusalem.' Now they were 'to preach repentance, and remission of sins to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.' Before this, their preaching had been confined to one nation. They had preached repentance, and remission of sins to the Jews only. Under their first commission they were commanded 'not to go into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans they were not to enter.' But now the commission runs, 'go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel,' 'preach repentance and remission of sins,' not to the house of Israel only, but 'to every creature,' and for this reason they were recommissioned, and supernaturally endued with the *gift of tongues*, and with other miraculous gifts, that they might preach the gospel 'in demonstration of the spirit and power.'

I willingly admit that these apostles increased in knowledge relative to the gospel of Jesus after they were recommissioned, and even after the day of Pentecost, but I utterly deny that this fact is a proof that they were not, previously to the death of Jesus, preachers of the gospel. The gospel which John, Jesus, the Twelve, and the Seventy preached, previously to the day of Pentecost, may be aptly represented by a scion, which in the days of John was planted, and which by the blessing of God, and the ministry of Jesus, the Twelve and the Seventy, continued to grow, until on the day of Pentecost it became a great tree. It was not another tree because of its wonderful growth, but the very same; and just the same do I consider to have

been the case with the gospel. It was in a state of progressive development from the days of John until Pentecost, and perhaps for some time after, and consequently the change of commission, affected no change in the gospel, nor of its ordinances, for both baptism and the Lord's supper were instituted as gospel ordinances before Christ's disciples were recommissioned; and we have already proved that the apostle Paul received the *supper*, by revelation from heaven, long afterwards; and as it respects baptism, if any person will read the book of Acts, carefully, he will find the apostles every where baptizing the people, both *men* and *women*.

Mr. W. admits that the apostles baptised with water after the day of Pentecost, but he thinks it was "a clinging fragment which they had brought over with them from their first commission under the law;" and not being content with exposing their faults, and blunders under their first commission, he sets himself to work, in order to prove that they might have made some "egregious mistakes" under their second; and as they might have erred, (excellent logician!) he takes it for granted that they certainly did err, when they preached water baptism. But granting as I do, with all readiness, that the apostles not only might, but did "err in judgment" about many matters, under both their commissions, and that they had their prejudices in common with the other Jews, I again ask what has this to do with the subject? Suppose Peter, if you please, to have been a mere ignoramus, and as full of Jewish prejudices as an egg is of meat, and what will you gain by it? It is not on the intellectual powers of Peter that I rely, but on the living God! You may call Peter a Jew!—a fisherman!—a philosopher!—a fool!—call him what you please! but I say that the Holy Spirit was not a Jew!—had no Jewish prejudices!—could not err in judgment!—and as this Spirit 'gave Peter utterance,' it must have constrained him to utter truth! We must not forget that the preaching of the apostles was something of a miraculous nature. 'They spoke as the Spirit gave them utterance!' 'It is not ye that speak, but the spirit of my Father that speaketh in you!' Now was the Eternal God a Jew? Was he under

the influence of Jewish prejudices? If he was not, (and where is the impotent worm who will presume to say he was?)—I say, if the God of the Universe was not under the influence of Jewish prejudices, then baptism is an ordinance of the gospel, and as such is worthy of all acceptation; for God preached it, and preached it too after the day of Pentecost through the medium of the apostles, to whom Jesus said, 'it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of my Father!' So little had the intellectual powers of Peter to do in this great concern of preaching the gospel, that on the day of Pentecost, God spake through him one truth, if no more, which he did not understand until eight years afterwards. The truth was this: 'For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.' The latter part of this promise evidently relates to the calling of the Gentiles, which is a fact which Peter seems never to have understood, until in a vision he beheld the miraculous sheet!

I cannot express my admiration of the wisdom of Jesus, manifested in the selection of his apostles. They were neither *orators*, nor *philosophers*, but *fishermen*, and fishermen too, of very ordinary capacities. They seem however to have had *eyes*, and *ears*, and *memory*, and *honesty*, and these were all the natural qualifications which Jesus required in those whom he intended to constitute his ambassadors to the ends of the earth. He was resolved that infidels should never have cause to say, in any subsequent time, that *riches*, or *eloquence*, or *philosophy*, had had any influence in establishing his kingdom among men. The faith of his disciples was to stand 'not in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God,' even in that power which the apostles received from on high on the day of Pentecost. Hence Paul says to the church at Corinth, 'For you see your calling, brethren, that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble *call you*. But the foolish ones of the world, God has chosen to *call you*, that he might put to shame the *wise;* and the weak ones of the world God has chosen, that he might put to shame the strong ones. And the ignoble ones of the world, and the despised ones, God has chosen, and those who are not, that

he might bring to nought those who are. That no flesh might boast in his presence. *Macknight's Translation.* Had Mr. W. acquainted himself with this peculiarity of the Christian religion, he would certainly never have exhibited the weaknesses of the apostles as evidences of the fallacy of any of their doctrines: but as he has done so, we shall consider his course as subserving the cause of infidelity; for if it can be proved that the apostles in any instance taught falsehood, then I say they might have so taught in more instances than one; and if so, I should not know when to believe them. But as the matter stands, all is easy. The apostles were men, fallible men; mere earthen vessels that contained heavenly treasures; miraculously inspired, in order to the communicating of these treasures: as preachers and teachers completely under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, so that they always spake truth, and may therefore be always accredited with the greatest safety. Believest thou this? I fear that Mr. W., and many others, would much rather have the privilege of *picking* and *culling* their doctrines, and of receiving what may suit their convenience, and rejecting others as the productions of apostolic ignorance, than to believe, and receive the whole truth, from the testimony of these inspired ambassadors!

Mr. W. seems to possess but little regard for any of the apostles except Paul. Paul he thinks was a decided opposer to water baptism, and a brilliant administrator of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. He tells us that 'Paul was not sent to baptize,' and that 'he' (Paul) 'thanks God, that with the exception of two, he had not deviated from his commission.' Mr. W. refers to what Paul said, in 1. Cor. i. chap. 'I thank God,' says Paul, that I baptized none of *you.* Mark the expression: *none of you.* The church at Corinth was in a state of faction, and Paul thanks God that he had baptized none of these factionists, except a few whom he afterwards mentions; and from this we learn that he had a very contemptible opinion of a factionist. But why did he thus thank God? is not this a proof that he was an opposer of water baptism? You shall have his own answer: 'Lest' says he, 'any should say that I had baptized in mine own name.' They being factionists, and

calling themselves, as nearly all factionists do, after the names of men, or things, unauthorized by the King, led the apostle to fear, that some person would accuse him, of having baptized the Paulites at Corinth into his own name. The next question is, how many did he baptize? Mr. W. endeavors to persuade us, that he had only baptized two in all his life. Let us ask Paul what he has to say as to the number baptized by him at Corinth? 'I baptised Crispus, and Gaius, and also the household of Stephanus, besides I know not whether I baptized any other.' Now let us have a sample of Mr. W's. skill in arithmetic, and I think we shall see that he is just as good in numbers, as he is in divinity! Mr. W. says that Paul baptized but 'two.' This then must have been his method of calculation: Crispus, and Gaius make one, and the household of Stephanus, consisting probably of seven or eight, make two. Admirable arithmetician!! This is about as accurate as is this sermon in general. In another place he says, and 'the eunuch said unto Peter, see here is water.' It should have been Philip, instead of Peter!!

But does not Paul say 'he was not sent to baptize but to preach the gospel?' Yes: he does not say, however, that baptism is not a gospel ordinance. And besides, Mr. W. tells us that Paul baptized 'the twelve men at Ephesus 'with the holy influence or flame,' so that I think the above text will puzzle him, at least as much as it will me. Paul says in round terms, that he was not sent to baptize. He does not say he was not sent to baptize with water; but that he was not sent to baptize at all. Mr. W. however seems very willing to permit him to baptize with the Holy Spirit, a thing that no man ever did, or ever can do, though Paul declares that he was not sent to baptize. I have logically, just as much right to say that Paul meant, he was not sent to baptize with Holy Spirit, as Mr. W. has to say, he meant, he was not sent to baptize with water: but I will just take him at his word, and say, that he was not sent to baptize at all. And what then? Will it follow that baptism is not an ordinance of the gospel? By no means. Paul might have had twenty reasons for not going into the water, and every one of them might have been different

from the one assigned by Mr. W. For instance he might have been a delicate man, having been brought up a scholar at the feet of Gamaliel, and as God is not 'a hard Master,' he might have concluded that the labor of constant preaching, together with the numerous hardships of other kinds which Paul had to encounter, would be as much as this old soldier of the cross ought to bear. This supposition may be true, or other suppositions relative to Paul's reason for not baptizing may also be true; but the supposition that Paul was opposed to water baptism, is false upon the very face of it; because it is in contradiction to the law of our King,—to the preaching of the Holy Spirit through the apostles, and to the whole genius of the Christian religion.

Mr. W. thinks that 'if water immersion be indispensably necessary to constitute men members of the Christian church, then the vast multitudes who were converted to the faith of the gospel by the preaching of Paul, are all lost, except two!"—that is, Crispus and Gaius, and the household of Stephanus:—these '*two*.' Do not be alarmed, friend W., if all except these two should be lost for a time, your system will find them again! But I must here tell the reader, that though Paul did not himself baptize, he generally carried one or more evangelists with him, who did administer this ordinance. It is in fact a doubtful case, whether any of the apostles baptized a great number of individuals, for even at the house of Cornelius we find Peter commanding the believers to be baptized, by which it seems that he did not himself personally administer this ordinance on that occasion, and if you will turn to the 18th chapter of Acts, you will find that although Paul was not sent to baptize, and had baptized but few at Corinth, yet all the members of that church had been baptized. 'And Crispus,' says our historian, 'the chief ruler of the synagogue, believed on the Lord with all his house: and many of the Corinthians believed, and were baptized.' All it seems that believed, were baptized: and I now challenge Mr. W. to prove that any living soul was ever admitted into any Christian church in the days of the apostles, who had not been previously baptized with water. The law of our King, is, 'except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter

into the kingdom (or church) of God.' I know that Mr. W. has given us a new translation, or rather a perversion of this verse; but after the inaccuracies, and egregious blunders in which I have already detected him, I think he will not be very implicitly followed as a translator. In fact, his own apostle proves that before a man could consistently be called a Paulite, Paul must have been crucified for him, and he must have been baptized into the name of Paul; and consequently, before any man can consistently be called a Christian, Christ must have been crucified for him, and he baptized into the name of Christ.

Mr. W. wrests and perverts the passage in the nineteenth of Acts, as in fact he does almost every other passage on which he puts his fingers. He tells us 'and when they had heard this,(that is what Paul had said about John's baptism,) Paul laid his hands upon them, and the holy influence (Christ's baptism) came upon them, and they spake with tongues.' Now this is a positive, manifest, and daring falsehood. The passage itself shall expose Mr. W. 'And it came to pass that while Apollos was at Corinth, Paul having passed through the upper coasts, came to Ephesus; and finding certain disciples, he said unto them, have ye received the Holy Spirit since ye believed? And they said unto him, we have not so much as heard whether the Holy Spirit *is received*.* And he said unto them, unto what were ye then baptized? And they said, unto John's baptism. Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus. When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Spirit came upon them; and they spake with tongues and prophesied.' Now from the above account which Luke gives us of this matter, you will observe, that Paul did not lay his hands on these men, and that consequently the Holy Spirit did not come upon them, until after they were baptized the second time. Mr. W. says that 'when they heard this, Paul laid his hands on them, &c.' But Luke gives us a very different view of this sub-

*Macknight's Translation.

ject. He says, that 'when they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus,' and that after this 'Paul laid his hands on them.' They were baptized in the name, that is, by the authority of the Lord Jesus; just as Peter said to the lame man in the third of Acts, 'in the name,' that is, by the authority 'of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, rise up and walk.'

All the acts of John and of his disciples were valid, until the apostles of Jesus were recommissioned, just as the official and legal acts of a sheriff, or of any other officer are valid, until their commission expires, and no longer. The commission of John and of his disciples expired when the apostles of Christ were recommissioned, but this new commission no more supposes a change in the gospel, nor its ordinances, than the putting an old sheriff out of office, and the commissioning a new one, or the commissioning the old one over again, supposes a change in the laws of the commonwealth. The change, in both cases, would be a change in the commission *only*. But still, as the acts of a former sheriff are not valid, after his successor has been commissioned in his place, so were the acts of the disciples of John not valid, any longer than until the disciples of Christ received their second commission. Now if you will read carefully the latter part of the 18th chapter of Acts, you will find that Apollos, one of John's disciples, 'an eloquent man and mighty in the scriptures,' and who was also 'instructed in the way of the Lord,' though 'he knew only the baptism of John,' had been preaching at Ephesus with 'fervency of spirit,' sometime before Paul had the above interview with the twelve men, on whom he laid his hands, and as it seems Apollos preached, we know not how often, before Aquilla and Priscilla expounded to him the way of God more perfectly,' we have strong circumstantial evidence that these twelve men had been baptized by Apollos, during his above named visit at Ephesus, and therefore after his commission had expired, and consequently after his acts as an immerser had ceased to be valid. This view of the subject, will not only explode the combustible objections of my opponent, but it will remove some difficulties, which might otherwise perplex our own minds with respect to the

baptism by which Christ and his apostles were baptized: for they could not have been baptized under any other than the first commission: and consequently if their baptism was valid, the baptism of every individual who was baptized previously to the expiration of that commission, must have been valid also. We will now return again, if you please, to Mr. W.

We have seen in what way he has perverted the text in the 19th of Acts, but it will do us no harm to look at this matter once more. It is evident from the testimony given by Luke, in this chapter, that the twelve men first heard what Paul had to say relative to John's baptism: and secondly, that they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus; and then, thirdly, that Paul laid his hands on them: and fourthly, that they 'spake with tongues and prophesied.' Mr. W. only says, that they 'spake with tongues;' but Luke says that 'they spake with tongues and prophesied.' They received two *spiritual gifts*, the *gift* of *tongues* and the *gift* of *prophecy*. 'This was an instance,' says Mr. W., 'of the administration of Christ's baptism, and water was not applied.' A pretty instance truly! No sir; it is one instance in which you have been detected in walking in craftiness, and handling the word of God deceitfully!! Why did you not tell your readers, as Luke told his, that 'when they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, and that when Paul laid his hands on them, the Holy Spirit came upon them." No. This did not suit your purpose, and therefore you left out of your account the very circumstance which would have shown with the clearness of the noonday sun, your gross misrepresentation of this whole affair!

But suppose we admit that Paul did baptize these twelve men with the 'holy influence or flame,' 'Christ's baptism,' as you call it, I ask in what manner was it administered? *Ans.* By the laying on of hands! It was not then by preaching the gospel as you have in other places insinuated. Now if this spiritual baptism, was administered by the laying on of hands, and was the only *saving* baptism, why do not you administer it in the same way? You would do us, 'water Baptists,' and perhaps many of your own proselytes,

a very essential service, if some of your Holy Spirit *baptizers*, would lay your hands on us, as did Peter, and John, on the converts of Samaria, provided you would save us thereby, with 'the holy influence or flame!' You say that this 'sacred flame was the influence of the gospel,' and was the baptism the Saviour ordered them to practice, when he said, 'Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature.' Now if this be correct, the influence of the gospel was communicated by the laying on of the apostles, hands, and if so, then those who have lived, and died without receiving this favor from the apostles, or from their successors, if they ever had any successors, must have lived and died destitute of the 'influences of the gospel.' Let us have some of the bright shining,—some of the midnight splendor of your 'Star' on this subject, friend Waldo. Even *starlight* upon this subject will be better than *no light*:—if you can give us neither *sunlight*, nor *moonlight*, let us have some of your *starlight!*

But in the mean time permit me to observe, that it can be proved conclusively, that the impartation of the Holy Spirit by the imposition of the hands of the apostles, was something very different from the holy 'influence of the gospel!' I have already shown, that *love* or *charity*, is 'more excellent' than all *spiritual gifts*, of whatever kind they may be: yea, that a man might have all these gifts, and be 'nothing!' Read the 12 and 13 chap. 1 Cor. for testimony on this subject. Now these things being facts incontrovertible, it follows that the apostolic custom of laying on of hands, was not for the purpose of communicating the 'influence of the gospel,' and consequently that it was not that baptism with which they were to baptize the disciples in all nations, but only a process by which was imparted miraculous gifts. And this appears to have been the fact with respect to the twelve men at Ephesus. They spake with *tongues* and *prophesied*. By reading the above named chapters, you will find Paul speaking of these very gifts which were received by these twelve men and declaring *love* to be far better than all such *gifts*.

In the remaining part of this sermon there is a good deal of spouting about types, and shadows, and covenants, and

middle walls, and meats,—a world of lumber, as irrelevant to the subject as any thing can well be imagined to be. Mr. W. seems to forget, or perhaps he never knew, that the Epistles were every one addressed to churches, all the members of which had been baptized. Yes! but as he started out with a metamorphosis, he must for the sake of consistency, continue his metamorphosis throughout! In the beginning of his aerial, and sophistical flight, he was tempted for the sake of convenience no doubt, to change meats and holy days into the external rites of the church, and having changed them, his great love of consistency keeps him to his text from beginning to end. Circumcision means baptism;—the middle wall means baptism;—carnal commandments mean baptism;—the rudiments of the word mean baptism;—every thing, with the exception of baptism itself, means baptism in his vocabulary! Now I say that the apostles never did write one word against water baptism, and if Mr. W. disputes this position, let him give me chapter and verse; but let him not spiritualize meats, and drinks, and holy days, and wildernesses in order to prove his points!

If we would deal fairly, and candidly with ourselves while examining this subject, we should not, I think, find any great difficulty in arriving at right conclusions. The law concerning baptism which was enacted by the great Head of the church, ought to silence forever, every man, who makes the smallest pretensions to christianity. 'Except a man be born of *water*, and of the *Spirit*, he cannot enter into the kingdom, (church,) of God.' It is evident that *water* in this text means one thing, and *Spirit* another; for if *these terms* be synonimous, the text is nonsense. 'Except a man be born of *Spirit*, and of *Spirit*!' Is not this nonsense? Mr. W. translates the text thus: 'Except a man be born of *water*, or of the *Spirit*.' But even if we should admit this to be a correct translation of the original, which however is not the case, still the text would irresistibly prove water baptism, and would also attach more importance to that ordinance than we are at present willing to attach to it: for according to this modern translation, a birth by water, would give us as free an admission into the

kingdom, as would a spiritual birth! I am astonished, that a young man like Mr. W., whose reputation as a linguist has never been established, should have ventured so far, on his own bare authority, as he has done in this sermon, in changing, mutilating, and perverting several interesting portions of Holy Writ, because as they stand in the common version they are inimical to his views. In this way every innovator might make the Bible prove his positions, however chimerical they might be. Had Mr. W. given us respectable authority from among biblical critics for the alterations which he has made in our translation. I should have considered the arguments which he has adduced from such passages, as being more worthy of notice; but when the whole is given wholesale and retail merely on his authority, I must beg to be excused from submitting, exalted as he may conceive such authority to be. And besides, I am confident that every respectable critic would be ashamed of the translation which he has given us of the above verse, for though I have seen many criticisms upon it, never did I see one similar to Mr. W's., before. Mr. W. also tells us that the text in John's epistle, 'there are three that bear record on earth,' is similar to the above text, but that 'as the spuriousness of that passage is so obvious, and so universally admitted, he shall give it no attention.' Thus you see he evades the force of one of these texts, by translating it anew, and of the other, by telling us that it is spurious! He seems to admit that if it were not spurious it would bear hard against his system, and this is the reason why he wishes to throw it out of the way. But permit me here to ask, what critic has ever pronounced this text to be spurious? Not one that I have ever read! It is I believe, universally admitted by all Christian commentators, to be genuine. The verse which precedes this, 'there are three that bear record in heaven' has generally been supposed to be spurious; but still those critics who reject this verse, acknowledge the one which Mr. W. rejects, as genuine. If I am not much mistaken our Bibles would be diminished to a very shall size, could Mr. W. dismiss from them every verse which he considers to be exceptionable! What havoc does this modern Sampson make of the Scriptures!!

Now as Mr. W. has rejected this text, 'there are three that bear witness on earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood' on the authority of critics! when he can produce no such authority it need not be expected that he will blame me for receiving it as genuine on the authority of critics: and as he says that it 'expresses a similar idea' with that in the third of John, it follows, that if water in that text is to be understood literally, it must be so understood in this place: and that it must be understood literally in this place, is evident, because the Spirit, and the blood, are also spoken of as bearing witness; and there would be just as much common sense in spiritualizing the Spirit, and the blood, as the water! The Spirit by the word, testifies that Christians are born again! The water of baptism testifies, to the same fact, we having been born of water! and 'the blood of sprinkling which speaketh better things than the blood of Abel,' confirms these testimonies, we 'having obtained redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our sins.' Hence we may say, we were 'saved by the washing of water by the word,' remission having been procured by the blood of Christ, and received through faith, in the act of baptism. And hence also, Jesus is said to have 'come by water and blood, not by water only, but by water and blood.' Though Jesus was thirty years of age before he was baptized, he never officiated in the ministry of the word until he was 'born of water;' nor was he ever invested with the priestly office until 'he entered heaven by his own blood.' But being now a high priest to make reconciliation for the sins of his people, he has appointed the *Spirit*, the *water*, and the *blood*, to witness to us concerning all things which belong to our peace, here, and hereafter; and as these 'three witnesses agree in one' a rejection of the testimony of *any one* of them, is a rejection of the testimony of them *all!*

Now this view of the subject is irresistibly confirmed by the commission which Jesus gave to his apostles after his resurrection, as well as by the practice of the apostles after they were endued with power from on high. This commission is expressed by each of the four evangelists. Matthew, has it thus: 'All authority is given unto me in hea-

ven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit,' &c. Mark expresses it: 'Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.' Luke informs us that he commanded them to 'preach repentance, and the remission of sins, in his name, among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.' And John says, he said to them, 'Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained.'

Now as this law concerning baptism was enacted by the King of the Universe, and was rendered obligatory on all the nations of the earth, wherever, and whenever the gospel should be preached to them, and as the New Testament gives no account of it ever having been repealed, we are necessarily constrained to believe it to be as much our duty to submit to this law, as to any other law which Jesus has enacted for our benefit, and as sin is the transgression of the law, we confess that we are incapable of seeing why the man who refuses to submit to the requisitions of the King in this particular, is not as real a transgressor, and consequently as real a sinner, as is the man who refuses to obey any other law which has been enacted by our King. Such frothy, and conjectural objections as those urged by our opponents against baptism, will never exculpate the transgressors of this law from blame, any more than similar objections against other Divine commands will exculpate from blame those who wilfully violate them. Those who object to water baptism because it appears to them to be nonessential, are guilty of as daring and presumptuous a rebellion against the kingdom of heaven, as the refractory outlaw would be guilty of, against this commonwealth, who should refuse to submit to its laws, because they might appear to him to be nonessential. When a law has been enacted by legislative authority, the people are bound by that authority, to submit to it until such time as it shall be repealed; and it must be unequivocally repealed too; that is, it must be a well known fact, capable of proof from the proper documents; for a

citizen who should violate a law of this commonwealth, would certainly be liable to its penalty, provided no documents could be obtained by which to prove its repeal: and a citizen who should plead the unequivocal repeal of any law, without presenting any documents by which to prove such repeal, would justly be suspected for either insanity or knavery.

The law of baptism was enacted by the great Lawgiver of Zion, and this Lawgiver has subsequently to the enacting of this law, given us no document by which it can at all be proved that the law of baptism has ever been repealed, and consequently we are bound by every sacred obligation to submit to it. And hence, also, we see the apostles, according to the testimony of Luke in the book of Acts, every where baptizing, or causing to be baptized, the myriads who believed the gospel through their instrumentality. Yes: Gentiles as well as Jews, when they believed the doctrine of the cross, submitted to this ordinance. And as Christ said to his apostles 'it is not ye that speak but the Spirit of my Father that speaketh in you,' we are forced to the conclusion, by this, as well as by many other evidences, that the law of baptism was sanctioned by the Eternal Spirit, and by all the heavenly intelligences, and that it consequently cannot be rejected consistently with the dictates of the Spirit of God. On the day of Pentecost, in Samaria, at the house of Cornelius, in Corinth, at Ephesus, in the case of the eunuch, Lydia, the jailor, in all cases, and in all places, whether among barbarians, Scythians, bond or free, male or female, we find that baptism under the ministry of the apostles, almost instantaneously succeeded faith. The apostle Paul, who is supposed by my friend W. to be a great opposer to water baptism, only delayed after believing that Jesus was the Christ, about the space of three days; but not one moment did he delay after he heard that it was his duty to be baptized. 'Arise,' said the disciple Ananias under a commission directly from the Almighty, and bearing a message glowing with Divine light, '*Why tarriest thou, arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord!*' and we are told in the viii. Acts that he '*arose forthwith and was baptized!*'

I could were it necessary pursue this subject much farther, and produce much additional testimony in favor of water baptism. But for the present these hints must suffice. What I have written may be instrumental in preserving some precious souls from falling a prey to the palpable sophistry of Mr. W's. sermon, and in engaging others to attend with deeper interest, to these monumental evidences of our holy religion. Amen.—[EDITOR.

THE PROPAGATION OF CHRISTIANITY.

BY PALEY.

The following extract from Paley, is designed to show with what miraculous speed the Christian doctrine extended its influence among the families, tribes, and nations of the earth, while it was propagated by the Apostles; and is, in our estimation, a proof incontrovertible, that its evidences were miraculous; no natural, or human cause being adequate to such effects. Against all the eloquence, learning, prejudices, habits, wealth and wickedness, of all the then existing generations of men, Gentiles, as well as Jews, we see the religion of Jesus, rolling onward like a mighty torrent, and bearing down, by the weight of its own evidences, every opposing work, or device of its adversaries. In a few years after the death and resurrection of its Divine Founder, we find a multitude of the ministers of the sanctuary among the Jews, as well as honorable men, and women not a few among the Gentiles, doing homage to Zion's King, through faith in the doctrine of the cross; and in opposition to all the prohibited desires of the flesh, walking in the ordinances of the New Institution, blameless. How can these things be accounted for, without the admission of supernatural interposition? Surely the *fiat* of the Almighty must have gone forth! Surely the Creator of all worlds, and of all intelligences, must have made manifest his power, for the salvation of his creatures!—ED.

'In this argument, the first consideration is the fact; in what degree, within what time, and to what extent, Christianity actually was propagated.

The accounts of the matter which can be collected from our books, are as follow: A *few days* after Christ's disappearance out of the world, we find an assembly of disciples at Jerusalem, to the number of "about one hundred and twenty;" which hundred and twenty were, probably, a little association of believers, met together, not merely as believers in Christ, but as personally connected with the apostles and with one another. Whatever was the number of believers then in Jerusalem, we have no reason to be surprised that so small a company should assemble; for there is no proof that the followers of Christ were yet formed into a society, that the society was reduced into any order, that it was at this time even understood that a new religion (in the sense which that term conveys to us) was to be set up in the world, or how the professors of that religion were to be distinguished from the rest of mankind. The death of Christ had left, we may suppose, the generality of his disciples in great doubt, both as to what they were to do, and concerning what was to follow.

This meeting was held, as we have already said, a few days after Christ's ascension; for ten days after that event was the day of Pentecost, when, as our history relates, upon a signal display of divine agency attending the persons of the apostles, there were added to the society "about three thousand souls."

We read in the fourth chapter of the Acts, that soon after this, "the number of the men," i. e. of the society openly professing their belief in Christ, "was about five thousand." So that here is an increase of two thousand within a very short time. And it is probable, that there were many, both now and afterwards, who although they believed in Christ, did not think it necessary to join themselves to this society; or who waited to see what was likely to become of it. Gamaliel, whose advice to the Jewish council is recorded Acts iv. 33. appears to have been of this description; perhaps Nicodemus, and perhaps also Joseph of Arimathea.—

This class of men, their character, and their rank, are likewise pointed out by St. John, in the twelfth chapter of his gospel, "nevertheless, among the chief rulers also many believed on him; but because of the Pharisees they did not confess him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue: for they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God." Persons such as these, might admit the miracles of Christ, without being immediately convinced that they were under obligation to make a public profession of Christianity, at the risk of all that was dear to them in life, and even of life itself.

Christianity, however, proceeded to increase in Jerusalem by a progress equally rapid with its first success; for, in the next chapter of our history, we read that "believers were the more added to the Lord, *multitudes* both of men and women." And this enlargement of the new society appears in the first verse of the succeeding chapter, wherein we are told, that, "when the number of the disciples was *multiplied*, there arose a murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected; and, aftewards in the same chapter it is declared expressly, that "the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly, and that a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith."

This I call the first period in the propagation of Christianity. It commences with the ascension of Christ; and extends, as may be collected from incidental notes of time, to something more than one year after that event. During which term, the preaching of Christianity, so far as our documents inform us, was confined to the single city of Jerusalem. And how did it succeed there? The first assembly which we meet with of Christ's disciples, and that a few days after his removal from the world, consisted of "one hundred and twenty." About a week after this, "three thousand were added" in one day; and the number of Christians, publicly baptized, and publicly associating together, were very soon increased to "five thousand."—"Multitudes both of men and women continued to be added;" "disciples multiplied greatly," and "many of the Jewish priesthood, as well as others, became obedient to

the faith; and this within a space of less than two years from the commencement of the institution.

By reason of a persecution raised against the church at Jerusalem, the converts were driven from that city, and dispersed throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria.—Wherever they came, they brought their religion with them; for our historian informs us, that, 'they that were scattered abroad, went every where preaching the word.' The effect of this preaching comes afterwards to be noticed, where the historian is led, in the course of his narrative, to observe that *then* (i. e. about three years posterior to this) 'the churches had rest throughout all Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria, and were edified, and walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, were multiplied.' This was the work of the second period, which comprises about four years.

Hitherto the preaching of the gospel had been confined to Jews, to Jewish proselytes, and to Samaritans. And I cannot forbear from setting down in this place, an observation of Mr. Bryant's, which appears to me to be perfectly well founded:—'The Jews still remain, but how seldom is it that we can make a single proselyte! There is reason to think, that there were more converted by the apostles in one day, than have since been won over in a thousand years.'

It was not yet known to the apostles, that they were at liberty to propose the religion to mankind at large. That 'mystery,' as St. Paul calls it, and as it then was, was revealed to Peter by an especial miracle. It appears to have been about seven years after Christ's ascension, that the gospel was preached to the Gentiles of Cesarea. A year after this, a great multitude of Gentiles were converted at Antioch in Syria. The expressions employed by the historian are these—'a great number believed and turned to the Lord;' 'much people was added to the Lord;' the apostles Barnabas and Paul taught much people.' Upon Herod's death, which happened the next year, it is observed, that 'the word of God grew and multiplied.' Three years from this time, upon the preaching of Paul at Iconium, the metropolis of Lycaoni, 'a great multitude both of Jews

and Greeks believed;' and afterwards, in this very progress, he is represented as 'making many disciples' at Derbe, a principal city in the same district. Three years after this, which brings us to sixteen after the ascension, the apostles wrote a public letter from Jerusalem to the Gentile converts at Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia, with which letter Paul travelled through these countries, and found the churches 'established in the faith, and increasing in number daily.' From Asia the apostle proceeded into Greece, where, soon after his arrival in Macedonia, we find him at Thessalonica; in which city 'some of the Jews believed, and of the devout Greeks a great multitude.' We meet also here with an accidental hint of the general progress of the Christian mission, in the exclamation of the tumultuous Jews of Thessalonica, 'that they who had turned the world upside down, were come thither also.' At Berea, the next city at which St. Paul arrives, the historian who was present, informs us, that '*many* of the Jews believed.' The next year and a half of St. Paul's ministry was spent at Corinth. Of his success in that city we receive the following intimations: 'that *many* of the Corinthians believed and were baptized,' and 'that it was revealed to the apostle by Christ, that he had much people in that city.' Within less than a year after his departure from Corinth, and twenty-five years after the ascension, St. Paul fixed his station at Ephesus, for the space of two years and something more. The effect of his ministry in that city and neighborhood, drew from the historian a reflection, 'So mightily grew the word of God and prevailed.' And at the conclusion of this period, we find Demetrius at the head of a party, who were alarmed by the progress of the religion, complaining, that 'not only at Ephesus, but also throughout all Asia, (i. e. the province of Lydia and the country adjoining to Ephesus) this Paul hath persuaded and turned away much people.' Besides these accounts, there occur, incidentally, mention of converts at Rome, Alexandria, Athens, Cyprus, Cyrene, Macedonia, Philippi.

This is the third period in the propagation of Christianity, setting off in the seventh year after his ascension, and

ending at the twenty-eighth. Now, lay these three periods together, and observe how the progress of the religion by these accounts is represented. The institution, which properly *began* only after its author's removal from the world, before the end of thirty years, had spread itself throughout Judea, Galilee, and Samaria, almost all the numerous districts of the lesser Asia, through Greece, and the islands of the Ægean sea, the sea coast of Africa, and had extended itself to Rome, and into Italy. At Antioch in Syria, at Joppa, Ephesus, Corinth, Thessalonica, Berea, Iconium, Derbe, Antioch in Pisidia, at Lydia, Saron, the number of converts is intimated by the expressions 'a great number,' 'great multitudes,' 'much people.' Converts are mentioned, without any designation of their number, at Tyre, Cesarea, Troas, Athens, Phillippi, Lystra, Damascus. During all this time, Jerusalem continued not only the centre of the mission, but a principal seat of the religion; for when St. Paul returned thither, at the conclusion of the period of which we are now considering the accounts, the other apostles pointed out to him, as a reason for his compliance with their advice, 'how many thousands (myriads, ten thousands) there were in that city who believed.'

TO PATRONS.

As an apology to the patrons of this work, for not having published it regularly each month, as it was at first contemplated, I have only to say, that my labors as an Evangelist have so increased, that I cannot conveniently attend to the editorial department oftener than once in two months: as, however, I print *two* numbers together instead of *one*, I shall be able to complete the volume within twelve months from the commencement, as I at first proposed doing.

Those subscribers who are in arrears for this work, may, by transmitting to me forthwith one dollar each, by mail, post paid, directed to Cincinnati, Ohio, consider their subscription as paid; those who fail to do so, may expect to pay one dollar and fifty cents each. ☞ Punctuality is the life of business. [Editor.